

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/091,883		YOSHIMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Callie E. Shosho		1714	

All Participants:

(1) Callie E. Shosho.

(2) David McConoughey.

Date of Interview: 17 October 2003

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability *(see Part II above)*

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Mr. McConoughey. The amendment to claims 29, 33, 38, 40, 42, and 44 was made so that all the present claims recited claim language consistent with each other and the present specification. The amendment to claim 35 and claim 49 was made so that the claims recite proper Markush language. Claim 37 was cancelled given that in light of the amendment to claim 33 made in the amendment filed 7/17/03, claim 37, which disclosed pigment coated with metal oxide, was no longer properly dependent on claim 33, which discloses pigment coated with metal.

With respect to newly added claims 45-56, Mr. McConoughey stated, and examiner agreed, that the recitation "inorganic pigment coated not with a metal oxide but with a metal", does not raise any issues under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, given that such recitation does not constitute a negative limitation but rather discloses only that the pigment is coated with metal not metal oxide. Such recitation is supported in the present specification on, for instance, page 4, line 25-page 5, line 2 which discloses that the pigment is coated with either metal or metal oxide. Thus, the claim language of claims 45-56 makes clear that the pigment is coated with metal.